

Homogeneous Photometry IV: On the Standard Sequence in the Globular Cluster NGC 2419¹

Peter B. Stetson^{2,3}

Dominion Astrophysical Observatory, Herzberg Institute of Astrophysics,
National Research Council, 5071 West Saanich Road, Victoria, BC V9E 2E7, Canada;

Peter.Stetson@nrc.gc.ca

Received _____; accepted _____

²Guest Investigator of the UK Astronomy Data Centre.

³Guest User, Canadian Astronomy Data Centre, which is operated by the Herzberg Institute of Astrophysics, National Research Council of Canada.

ABSTRACT

A new analysis of CCD-based *BVRI* broad-band photometry for the globular cluster NGC 2419 is presented, based on 340 CCD images either donated by colleagues or retrieved from public archives. The calibrated results have been made available through my Web site. I compare the results of my analysis with those of an independent analysis of a subset of these data by Saha et al. (2005, PASP, 117, 37), who have found a color-dependent discrepancy of up to 0.05 mag between their *I*-band photometry and mine for stars in this cluster. I conclude that a major part of the discrepancy appears to be associated with small (a few hundredths of a second) shutter-timing errors in the MiniMos camera on the WIYN 3.5-m telescope. Smaller contributions to the anomaly likely come from (a) a color-scale error with a maximum amplitude of $\sim \pm 0.02$ mag in my secondary standard list as of September 2004; and (b) statistical effects arising from the previous study's use of a relatively small number of standard-star observations to determine a comparatively large number of fitting parameters in the photometric transformations.

Subject headings: Techniques: photometric; Astronomical databases: catalogs;
Globular clusters: individual

1. INTRODUCTION

The calibration of broad-band photometric measurements to a uniform system is an ongoing challenge in observational astronomy. The photometric systems in general use are tied to networks of standard stars whose relative brightnesses in different bandpasses have been repeatedly measured in the course of dedicated programs with carefully monitored equipment. Other observers can use their own equipment to measure the brightness ratios between as many as possible of these stars and the astronomical targets of their specific research programs. Obtaining precision in astronomical photometry is largely a matter of collecting sufficient photons under excellent observing conditions on numerous occasions over a long time, so that transient variations such as scintillation and erratic changes in the transparency of the terrestrial atmosphere eventually average out.

Obtaining accuracy in astronomical photometry is often a more demanding task. It requires the best possible match between the observer’s instrumental bandpasses and those employed by the establishers of the photometric standard system being used. In addition, the task requires that observations be made of numerous photometric standard stars under conditions that are as identical as possible to those under which the target observations are made. Enough standard-star observations must be made each night to allow the detection and *ex post facto* removal of systematic trends due to residual bandpass mismatch, the quasi-static properties of the atmosphere, and any other drifts or nonlinearities in the equipment. The resulting photometry can be no more accurate than the level to which these systematic errors can be identified, measured, and calibrated away.

¹Based in part on observations obtained at the 3.5m and 0.9m WIYN Telescopes. The WIYN Observatory is a joint facility of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Indiana University, Yale University, and the National Optical Astronomy Observatory (NOAO).

The problem of establishing standard photometric systems has not been solved for all time. The last few decades have seen the proliferation of telescopes with 4m, 8m, and 10m apertures, and the quantum efficiency of detectors is now close to 100%. To achieve photometric *accuracy* to a level similar to the *precision* that is possible with modern equipment, it is necessary to have available many standard stars with as broad as possible a range of properties (primarily temperature, secondarily surface gravity and chemical abundances). It is desirable for these stars to be similar in apparent brightness to the targets of modern research programs to minimize residual instrumental nonlinearity, but there is a competing temptation to define and employ relatively bright standard stars to minimize integration times. Standard stars should be distributed as widely as possible on the sky to minimize the time needed to slew the telescope and also to probe the same sightlines through the terrestrial atmosphere as the program observations, but they should also be densely packed on the sky to permit the simultaneous observation of standards with a wide range of intrinsic properties.

Arlo Landolt (1973, 1983, 1992) has devoted the greater part of his research career to establishing a network of standard stars in the Johnson *UBV* system and, more recently, the *RI* system defined by Kron, White & Gascoigne (1953) and subsequently extended and modified by Cousins (1976). Landolt refers to this as the “Johnson-Kron-Cousins system,” although some others call it the “Landolt system.” Landolt’s standard stars are concentrated near the celestial equator so that precisely the same photometric system is available in both geographic hemispheres, and standards are defined in every hour of right ascension so that some are accessible both on and off the meridian at any time of night or year. In every third hour of right ascension a particularly large number of standards is concentrated in a small area of sky to simplify the efficient calibration of all parts of wide-area detectors.

Landolt’s standard-system magnitudes have been established by photomultiplier measurements, a technique which can yield an accuracy often superior to that possible with a typical CCD camera. First, nonlinearity in a pulse-counting system is vanishingly small for faint targets, and still small but readily calibrated out for relatively bright targets. Second, flat-fielding and readout noise are generally non-issues with photomultipliers, while the difficulty of proper flat-fielding is often a limiting factor in CCD photometry.

Photoelectric photometry has the drawback that measuring apertures much larger than the full-width at half-maximum of a point source must be employed to contain the worst seeing conditions and extremes of tracking wander that may occur during the integration. This leads to the possibility of a systematic error in the average photometry of any given star due to the presence of an unseen fainter companion within the measurement aperture. More importantly, the technique limits the faintness of the stars that can be reliably measured, as the photon statistics inherent in subtracting a separate “sky” measurement from a “target plus sky” measurement quickly dominate the error budget when the target flux is small compared to the diffuse sky flux in a large measuring aperture. The relatively low quantum efficiency of the typical photomultiplier compared to the best CCDs and the reluctance of many TACs to take large-telescope time away from “science” for “calibration” are further factors limiting the faintness of photomultiplier-defined photometric standards. For these reasons, fundamental photometric standard stars suitable for calibrating modern detectors on large telescopes or on a medium-sized diffraction-limited telescope in space are not numerous.

Over the years, a number of individuals and groups have endeavored to provide faint photometric sequences for the modern age of large telescopes and electronic detectors. Many observers, for their own purposes, define local standard sequences near astronomical objects of interest by repeatedly comparing selected stars to the standards of Landolt or

others, and they often tabulate these standard sequences in their publications in hopes that they will help to place subsequent investigations by others on a common magnitude system, at least for that field. Examples are the photometry in the open cluster M67 by Schild (1983) and by Joner & Taylor (1990), who encouraged readers to employ their results for the cluster stars as reference standards for other research programs. In the course of an investigation of Cepheid variables in the nearby Sc galaxy NGC 300, Graham (1981) established a faint photometric sequence in a field near the galaxy. Walker & Suntzeff (1990, 1991) have similarly defined and subsequently refined a standard sequence in the field of SN1987A. Other examples abound.

However, there have also been attempts to augment the number of different standard fields suitable for modern imaging equipment as a general service to the community, quite apart from the scientific interest of any particular targets. Among these are the sequences produced by the “KPNO Video Camera/CCD Standards Consortium” (Christian et al. 1985). The Consortium adopted the wise policy of establishing standard sequences in star clusters, where an optimum surface density of stars can be achieved simply by placing the field an appropriate distance from the center of the cluster. Christian et al. chose six targets—two open clusters and four globular clusters—spaced at intervals of roughly four to six hours of right ascension. The 53 Consortium standard stars extend as faint as $V \sim 19$. In comparison, if one considers only the Landolt standards with at least five independent observations in *UBVRI* (thus not counting stars with *UBV* from his 1973 paper), there are 283 such stars and the faintest has $V = 17.8$. However, the 95th percentile (269/283) of the Landolt standards is at $V = 15.1$, forty times brighter than the faintest Consortium standard. Unfortunately, the precision of the Consortium photometry does not rival that of Landolt: the root-mean-square (r.m.s.) scatter of their observations was typically 0.02 mag per measurement, and most stars had two to four measurements apiece, yielding a typical final precision $\gtrsim 0.01$ mag for each tabulated magnitude. Among the 283 Landolt standards

with at least five observations, the median number of observations per star in *RI* is 20 (the median number is greater than this in *UBV* when the 1973 data are included) and the median standard error of a mean magnitude is 0.0030–0.0036 mag, depending upon the filter. Three of the six Consortium fields lie north of $+39^\circ$ declination, rendering them inaccessible to the major southern observatories, and the other three lie between $+9^\circ$ and $+18^\circ$, making them only modestly useful in the South.

There are other *UBVRI* standard lists in the literature. For instance, Graham (1982) published photomultiplier-based Johnson *UBV* and Kron-Cousins *RI* photometry for 102 stars in nine E-Region fields at -45° declination. These have been shown to be on the Landolt system to within an accuracy of a couple of mmag (Taylor & Joner 1996) in at least the *VRI* filters, which is comparable to the precision claimed for the best of the published indices. Like Landolt’s standards these stars are comparatively bright: among the 64 Graham stars with five or more observations, the 95th percentile (61/64) has $V = 14.7$. Stobie, Sagar & Gilmore (1985) provided CCD-based Johnson *BV* and Gunn *i* photometry for some 512 stars with $12 < V < 22$ in seven fields between declinations -60° and $+10^\circ$. They do not provide quantitative standard errors for their derived photometric indices, but they did estimate that in a single 30-minute exposure their root-mean-square measuring errors typically ranged from 0.02 mag per observation for $I < 18$ to 0.17 mag per observation for $20 < I < 21$. However, each field was observed four times in each filter with different exposure times: the authors give, as an example, 1 minute, 3 minutes, 10 minutes, and 30 minutes, but imply that these exposure times were not strictly adhered to for all fields. Furthermore, at least one field was observed on two occasions. Therefore, the actual precision of their tabulated results is hard to evaluate. As another example, Odewahn, Bryja & Humphreys (1992) obtained additional *BVR* CCD photometry for three of the KPNO Consortium fields both to increase the number of available standard stars and to improve the precision of the published indices.

As of February 28, 2005, a custom query of the NASA ADS Astronomy/Planetary database for the title words “standard,” “star,” and “photometry” combined with the “and” option yielded 103 abstracts, so I will not attempt a thorough, fair, and even-handed survey of the subject. The studies I have mentioned are probably representative or, perhaps, rather better than average.

During the pursuit of other research goals over the past two decades, I have maintained a parallel program of acquiring—by personally obtaining them at the telescope, by soliciting them from colleagues, or by requesting them from public archives—CCD images suitable for the eventual establishment of faint photometric sequences that would be accessible to the most sensitive broad-band imaging cameras available now or for the foreseeable future. With these I hope that other researchers and I will have the resources to enable us to calibrate our measured instrumental magnitudes to a common photometric system with an accuracy that is limited more by the equipment and observing techniques than by the lack of suitably defined reference standards. This would enable observations of different astronomical targets obtained on different occasions and with different equipment to be intercompared and interpreted with a degree of subtlety and confidence not currently possible. The first three papers in an ongoing series on the subject of “Homogeneous Photometry” have already been published (Stetson, Hesser & Smecker-Hane 1998; Stetson 2000; Stetson, Bruntt & Grundahl 2003; hereinafter HP-I, HP-II, and HP-III); this paper is the fourth. HP-II, in particular, goes into the philosophy and methodology of this work in greater depth than I will do here.

This network of standard stars both grows and evolves with time, as new observing runs are ingested into the system: new standard fields are added, more stars achieve the requisite number of observations and level of precision to satisfy the acceptance criteria for inclusion in the standard list, and occasionally stars are lost as new observations suggest

that they might be intrinsically variable. It may seem surprising, but the Landolt system that I am trying to match is itself something of a moving target, because a new observing run sometimes includes a Landolt standard that had not previously had any observations in my database. This slightly alters the “Landolt system” that I am trying to calibrate to, since even in Landolt’s data table each entry has some unknown random error with respect to the mean system. As new observations arrive for some Landolt standards but not for others, the different stars’ relative influence changes, which also causes some minor migration of the effective mean photometric system. Of course, all these uncertainties diminish as the number of different stars and the number of repeat observations included in the body of data both increase. The instantaneous state of my standard-star list is available to the community via the World-Wide Web². Before each new data release, however, I have tried to ensure that my photometric indices, on average, are on the Landolt system to within a very fine tolerance. This has been described in HP-II. The September 28, 2004 version of this catalog contained 36,950 stars suitable for use as standards, defined as stars with at least five observations on photometric occasions and standard errors of the mean < 0.020 mag in at least two of the *BVRI* filters, and no evidence of intrinsic variability in excess of 0.050 mag, r.m.s. Of these, 1,021 stars are fainter than $V = 21.00$.

A recent paper by Saha et al. (2005) also pursues the goal of establishing reliable faint photometric sequences in compact fields suitable for calibrating modern equipment. They presented *BVRI* magnitudes for some 800 stars in the fields of three globular clusters and, with one exception, found generally good agreement with previously published photometry for the same stars. The exception was the *I*-band magnitudes in the cluster NGC 2419, where they found a systematic offset compared to my posted data. The principal purpose of the present paper is to investigate the origins of this discrepancy.

²<http://cadwww.hia.nrc.ca/cadcbn/wdb/astrocat/stetson/query/>

2. NGC 2419

The distant globular cluster NGC 2419 is a fascinating target in its own right. According to the summary of cluster properties compiled by William E. Harris³ (Revision: February 2003), the cluster lies at the position $\alpha = 07^{\text{h}}38^{\text{m}}08^{\text{s}}.5$, $\delta = +35^{\circ}52'55''$ (J2000), $l^{\text{II}} = 180^{\circ}$, $b^{\text{II}} = +25^{\circ}$, thus in the Galactic anticenter direction and somewhat above the plane. It is some 84 kpc from the Sun and 92 kpc from the Galactic Center, making it the fifth most remote globular cluster believed bound to the Galaxy, surpassed only by Eridanus (95 kpc from the Center), Palomar 3 (96 kpc), Palomar 4 (109 kpc) and AM 1 (122 kpc). Indeed, among the eleven dwarf galaxy companions of the Milky Way, seven lie closer to the Galaxy than NGC 2419 (Sagittarius, LMC, SMC, Ursa Minor, Draco, Sculptor, Sextans), and only four lie beyond it (Fornax, Carina, Leo I, Leo II). The recently discovered system SDSSJ1049+5103 (Willman et al. 2004) lies at roughly half the distance of NGC 2419.

Unique among the outer-halo globulars, NGC 2419 is extremely luminous—with $M_V \approx -9.6$ —and is tied with NGC 6441 for third place among the globular clusters of the Milky Way, after NGC 6715 (-10.0) and ω Centauri = NGC 5139 (-10.3). None of the other globular clusters in beyond-the-SMC space (the aforementioned four plus Palomar 14) is brighter than $M_V \approx -6$ (Pal 4), or roughly 3% of the luminosity of NGC 2419. However, like the other outer-halo globular clusters, NGC 2419 has a core radius much larger than is found among the closer-in globulars: its half-light radius is some 18 pc, while most globular clusters closer than the SMC have half-light radii in the range 2–9 kpc. This combination of high luminosity, large radius, and great distance have led van den Bergh & Mackey (2004) to propose that NGC 2419 is in fact the stripped core of a former nucleated dwarf spheroidal galaxy (an origin also proposed for ω Centauri, which also has an extremely high luminosity and an unusually large radius, see Bekki & Freeman 2003 and references therein).

³<http://physwww.physics.mcmaster.ca/%7Eharris/mwgc.dat>

Harris et al. (1997) analysed images of NGC 2419 obtained with WFPC2 on the *Hubble Space Telescope* as part of a program to investigate the age structure of the globular cluster population. They found that in the morphology of its color-magnitude diagram, NGC 2419 closely resembles the inner-halo cluster M92 = NGC 6341, which it also closely resembles in metal abundance (*i.e.*, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -2.12$ for NGC 2419, -2.28 for M92 according to the Harris compilation catalog; see Harris et al. for a more detailed discussion). The ages of the two clusters were found to be identical to within the precision of the photometry.

In large part because it was included among the objects targeted by the “KPNO Video Camera/CCD Standards Consortium” (Christian et al. 1985), NGC 2419 has more data in the various imaging archives around the world than your average pointing on the sky. Many assiduous astronomers who have no interest at all in the cluster *qua* cluster have nevertheless observed it in hopes of better calibrating their data for objects they truly care about. Most of those astronomers included other Landolt and Consortium standard fields on their observing programs for the same reason. Of course, a few other astronomers have observed NGC 2419 because they wanted to study *it* specifically and, in general, they have also observed other standard fields on the same nights.

Because the target is so far away and because it has a very low metallicity, the giant branch and the blue horizontal branch provide an extremely broad color baseline at a magnitude level which is both bright enough for 2m-class telescopes and faint enough for *HST* and 8m-class telescopes with sensitive CCDs. These facts make NGC 2419 among the most tempting targets in the sky for the establishment of a faint photometric sequence. This, plus the fact that NGC 2419 had already been observed with WFPC2 on *HST* for the Harris et al. study (GO Proposal #5481: “Ages for the Outermost Globular Clusters: The Formation of the Galactic Halo: Cycle 4 High,” PI Hesser) led directly to its inclusion in the target lists for HST proposals 6937: “WFPC2 Cycle 6 CTE Calibration,” Stiavelli;

7628: “WFPC2 Cycle 7 Photometric Characterization,” Whitmore; 7630: “WFPC2 Cycle 7 CTE Characterization,” Casertano; 8821: “Cycle 9 WFPC2 CTE Monitor,” Riess; 9043: “Cepheid Distances to Early-type Galaxies,” Tonry; 9591: “Cycle 11 WFPC2 CTE Characterization,” Whitmore; and 9601: “WFPC2-ACS Photometric Cross-Calibration,” Koekemoer. Observations of NGC 2419 were also obtained with ACS in the course of program 9666: “Photometric Transformations,” Gilliland. In each case, NGC 2419 was observed specifically for the value of its local standard-star sequence in calibrating the photometric performance of the *HST* cameras. The legacy value of the Hesser/Harris data was also exploited by program 8095: “Accurate proper motions of Galactic halo populations,” Ibata.

It is obvious that certain, accurate knowledge of the Landolt-system magnitudes and colors of stars in the field of NGC 2419 would be of extreme value not only for understanding the idiosyncracies of that one astronomical object, and not just for somewhat better calibration of ground-based photometric images, but also for helping determine just how much confidence one can place on photometry obtained with a multi-billion-dollar space observatory.

3. REDUCTION METHODOLOGY

The use of DAOPHOT, ALLSTAR, ALLFRAME, DAOGROW, etc. to produce instrumental magnitudes from digital CCD images has been thoroughly discussed elsewhere. Here I will concentrate on how the aperture-corrected instrumental magnitudes are referred to the standard photometric system.

To describe the provenance of the present photometry, I must explain a few terms. The meaning of the word *photometric* as regards a night of optical observations is familiar

to most astronomers. In brief, it is a night upon which the extinction of incoming starlight is a nearly linear function of the path-length through the terrestrial atmosphere (when flux is expressed in logarithmic units, such as magnitudes) and is at most a weak function of time or azimuth. A *non-photometric* night is one where useful amounts of starlight are able to reach the telescope, but the assumptions of temporal and directional uniformity break down.

In mathematical terms, on a photometric night I relate the observed instrumental magnitudes to the standard magnitude system through an equation of the form

$$O_{ij} = L_i + Z + A \cdot C_i + K \cdot Q_j + \dots \quad (1)$$

where O_{ij} is the observed instrumental magnitude of standard star i in CCD image j ($O \equiv 25 - 2.5 \log[\text{DN sec}^{-1}]$); L_i is the standard magnitude of the same star on the system of—in the present instance—Landolt (1992); C_i is one of the usual colors of the star in the same standard system (*e.g.*, $B-V$, $V-I$, or $U-B$ as appropriate); $Q_j \equiv X_j - 1$, where X_j is the airmass of the j -th CCD image; and Z , A , and K are taken to be constants for an entire *dataset* (to be defined below). In this formulation, Z represents the standard-to-observed correction for a star of zero color observed at the zenith.

The “...” in Eq. (1) represents the fact that the software permits additional arbitrary polynomial terms in the various standard-system colors C , in Q , in $R \equiv Q \cos(\text{azimuth})$, in $S \equiv Q \sin(\text{azimuth})$, in $T \equiv$ the time of the observation in ($\pm$) hours from midnight UT, and in the x and y coordinates of the stars measured in the natural system of the CCD. The terms in R and S provide the ability to allow for modest directional nonuniformity of the extinction (such as the different meteorological effects of an ocean to the west and high desert mountains to the east, for instance), and are both continuous and smooth passing through the zenith—which is why I decided to use $Q \equiv X - 1$ rather than X to parameterize the airmass. Similarly, polynomial terms involving T provide the flexibility

to model small temporal variations in the extinction. Finally, the terms in x and y permit the correction of variations in photometric zero-point across the face of the camera due to scattered light in the flat fields or other illumination problems in an imperfect camera system. Calibration terms may be formed from any product of powers of colors, Q , R , S , T , x , and y as may be required by the data. For instance, for the B photometric bandpass I usually include a term in $(B-V) \cdot Q$ with an empirically determined coefficient of -0.016 to allow for the fact that the light of blue stars experiences more extinction than the light of red stars when passing through the terrestrial atmosphere, since more of their flux is concentrated toward the short-wavelength side of the bandpass. (Similar terms in the VRI transformations have been tried, and been found to be statistically insignificant.) I also generally include terms in C^2 for the broad $BVRI$ photometric bandpasses.

The transformation model on a non-photometric night is slightly different:

$$O_{ij} = L_i + Z_j + A \cdot C_i + \dots \quad (2)$$

In this case, each CCD image is assigned its own photometric zero-point, Z_j , on the basis of the standard stars it contains, while the color transformation is considered a constant to be determined for the dataset as a whole. Any CCD image containing two or more standard stars with a significant spread of standard-system color contributes to the definition of the color transformation as well as its own zero-point. A CCD image containing a single photometric standard can be assigned a photometric zero-point, but it contributes nothing to the definition of the color transformation; on a non-photometric night, an image containing no standards is useless for any photometric purpose (although such an image will be included in the ALLFRAME reductions for the contributions it can make to the completeness and astrometric precision of the star list). On a non-photometric night, transformation terms in Q , R , S , and T are generally superfluous, although higher-order terms in color and terms in x and y can still be determined when there are enough standard

stars in at least some images to allow their unambiguous determination.

A *dataset* is that block of data which is included in a single solution of a set of transformation equations—one for each filter—of either form (1) or form (2). A dataset is usually either the data from a single photometric night or the aggregate of the data from several non-photometric nights from the same *observing run*. An observing run is a set of consecutive or near-consecutive nights with the same telescope/camera/filter/detector system with no (to the best of my ability to judge, in the case of archival data) intervening instrument changes.

When several datasets are available from the same observing run (*i.e.*, several distinct photometric nights, or a mix of photometric and non-photometric nights), I begin by performing completely independent photometric reductions for all datasets. I then intercompare the resulting values for the transformation coefficients from the different samples. If they are inconsistent, I attempt to identify the cause, which is usually too few standard-star observations with a too-small range of airmass and/or color in one or more of the datasets.

The reductions of the different datasets from a given observing run may then be partially coupled together, as follows. The weighted average value of some coefficient in the transformation for each filter, generally beginning with the highest-order color term, is calculated from those datasets where it is well determined. It is then imposed as a “known” constant on all the datasets from the run, which are then re-reduced with one unknown fewer per bandpass. This process is repeated until only those coefficients which appear to be legitimately different from one dataset to the next—such as the linear extinction coefficient and the zero-point—remain freely and independently determined for each dataset. (Since the zero-point is defined at the zenith rather than outside the atmosphere, real changes in the extinction are reflected in real changes in the zero-point. This is not a problem for my

approach.) Occasionally the night-to-night differences are sufficiently small compared to the observation-to-observation scatter that it makes sense to impose unique zero-points and extinction coefficients on several consecutive photometric nights, making them in effect a single dataset.

The data from different chips of a multi-CCD mosaic camera are always treated as coming from distinct cameras and, hence, as constituting different datasets. That is to say, before obtaining the instrumental photometric indices no attempt is made to patch or “drizzle” the individual images into a larger master image of the field, and PSFs and aperture corrections are defined independently with no attempt to force continuity between adjacent chips. If it is judged that a variable PSF is required (in practise, I always employ variable PSFs when reducing data from large-format cameras), the variation is expressed in terms of the natural (x, y) coordinate system of each chip without reference to the position of the chip with respect to the optical axis of the telescope/camera system.

At the stage of calibrating the instrumental photometry to the standard system, however, the results of a single exposure from the different CCDs of a mosaic may be partially coupled, just as the separate nights from a single observing run may be coupled. In particular, after an initial reduction of the data from a photometric night, average extinction coefficients will generally be calculated and imposed in common to the different chips of the mosaic for a subsequent reduction run. Furthermore, if the data do not clearly demonstrate otherwise, often the high-order and occasionally the linear color terms in the transformations will be imposed as constant for all chips. The spectral response of a telescope and camera is determined by the transparency of the atmosphere; the reflectivity of the mirror(s); the transmissivity of the corrector, the dewar window and any other refractive optical elements; the throughput of the filter; and the spectral response of the CCDs. All of these components except the last are common to all the chips, and if the

CCDs are from the same batch (and if the filter is spatially uniform), real chip-to-chip differences in the shape of the spectral response may not be perceptible at the level required here. The different chips in a mosaic camera are always permitted to have individual photometric zero-points.

Occasionally, when observations for only a handful of standard stars are available and the range of airmass spanned is small, I will couple the extinction coefficients in the different filters. Average values formed from many excellent photometric nights with hundreds of standard stars on Kitt Peak, Cerro Tololo, La Silla, and La Palma consistently give extinction ratios $K_U : K_B : K_V : K_R : K_I$ close to 1.91 : 1.00 : 0.56 : 0.42 : 0.35. For instance, typical extinction coefficients for 7,000-foot observatories are $K_U = 0.48$, $K_B = 0.25$, $K_V = 0.14$, $K_R = 0.105$, and $K_I = 0.09 \text{ mag airmass}^{-1}$. On nights when such cross-filter averaging seems appropriate, the measured extinction coefficients in whichever filters are available are scaled to the B -equivalent extinction using these same ratios, a weighted average is formed, and this is scaled back to the appropriate values for the individual filters. I am convinced that this method is less likely to result in significant systematic errors than permitting the individual extinction coefficients to take on values entirely *ad libitum*, especially when standards are few and the range of airmass is small. On a few nights where the range of airmass is effectively nil, I impose mean extinction coefficients for the site rather than attempting to determine them from the data.

Once the effective mean zero-points for a night of observations have been established from the standard stars, inaccurate color transformations or extinction laws, and failure to recognize and correct any residual dependences on time of night or position on the detector will impose positive errors on the derived magnitude estimates from some observations and negative errors from others. Therefore, when averaged over many different runs, telescopes, and detectors, such neglect should primarily amplify the random noise in the averaged

results rather than introducing major systematic errors in the final photometric catalog. Suspicion can and should still adhere to “standard” stars established in only one or only a few observing runs.

4. DATA

The current generation of photometric indices for my standard stars is based upon an analysis of 649 datasets resulting from 622 nights of observations spread over 179 observing runs. Of these, 516 datasets from 336 nights were considered photometric and the remaining 133 datasets from 286 nights were reduced in non-photometric mode. (The number of photometric datasets exceeds the number of photometric nights because they include data from mosaic cameras; the number of non-photometric datasets is less than the number of non-photometric nights because I often merged the data from consecutive non-photometric nights into single datasets.)

Table 1 lists those observing runs where data for NGC 2419 were obtained. The observing-run labels in the first column are arbitrary and occasionally whimsical, so great significance should not be attached to the nomenclature. The second and third columns identify the telescope and detector that were used to acquire the data, and the fourth column indicates the approximate dates of the observations. The columns labeled “Clr” and “Cld” indicate the number of *datasets* resulting from the observing run that were reduced in respectively, clear-weather (Eq. 1) and cloudy-weather (Eq. 2) mode. Each of the MiniMos runs consisted of a single night of observing, but since the camera contains two CCDs, each night produced two datasets. Finally, the last four columns list the number of individual *exposures* of NGC 2419 that were obtained in each of the *BVRI* filters. In the case of the MiniMos observations, the actual number of CCD images is twice the number of exposures; since the chips have no overlap on the sky, the maximum number of images

that a given star can appear in is given by the number of exposures rather than the number of images. The observing runs listed for the WIYN 3.5m telescope and the WIYN 0.9m telescope run labeled “abi36” are the ones that were analysed by Saha et al. (2005), with the exception of the run labeled “wyna.” This night was non-photometric and was not included in the Saha paper, but I include it here, having analysed the night’s data using the non-photometric reduction mode described above. I include the night labeled “winyb” here for completeness, even though no observations of NGC 2419 were made on that night, because it will contribute to many of the comparisons that follow.

It should be noted that the images from the WIYN telescopes—both the 3.5m and the 0.9m—were bias-subtracted, flat-fielded, and otherwise preprocessed by Abi Saha before he gave them to me. Any differences of opinion on the quantitative results of these observations will originate in the analysis, not in how the data were acquired or preprocessed.

5. ANALYSIS

The derivation of the transformation constants from standard-star observations and the application of those transformations to program stars is carried out by two separate programs (Stetson 1993). CCDSTD considers all stellar observations in a given dataset, and solves Eqs. (1) or (2) using a robust least-squares analysis to determine the desired quantities Z , A , and K , etc., by comparing the observed quantities O to the “known” quantities L , C , and Q . If the universal time, the azimuth of the observation, or the (x, y) position of the star on the chip are included in the transformation, they are also considered to be error-free, known quantities. The instrumental magnitudes on the left-hand sides of the equations are considered to be measured quantities with associated standard errors; the errors assigned include both the measuring errors for the instrumental magnitudes as derived from the analysis of the CCD image and the standard errors of the mean

magnitudes given along with the photometry in the published standard-star lists. This approach is mathematically valid as long as the statistical uncertainty in the $O_{ij} - L_i$ differences overwhelm the uncertainties in $A \cdot C$, $K \cdot Q$, and the azimuth, time, and position effects.

The transformations thus derived are applied to the program stars by a different computer program, which employs the same two equations in a reversed sense. CCDAVE considers the data for only one star at a time, but it analyses simultaneously all the observations of that star from all datasets. It assumes that the values Z , A , K , and the other transformation parameters appropriate to each dataset are now known quantities. The instrumental magnitudes O on the left side of the equations are still measured quantities with associated uncertainties, and it is the standard-system magnitudes, L , which are now the unknown parameters to be determined by robust least squares. This requires some iteration, since the stars’ colors are not initially known. As each star is reduced its color is first assumed to be zero. Then all of the Eqs. (1) and (2) for all observations of that star from all filters, all nights, all observing runs, all telescopes, are solved by robust least squares to derive the unique maximum-likelihood standard-system magnitudes. These are used to compute the appropriate colors, and the least-squares reduction of the system of equations is repeated until the derived magnitudes and colors stop changing, a process which normally requires only a few iterations. These magnitudes and their associated standard errors are written to a computer file and the software proceeds to the next star on the list.

In what follows, I will attempt to adhere to the following naming scheme. If I refer to the “Landolt (1992)” photometric system, I am speaking of the photometric indices and standard errors given in that specific publication—although see the Appendix for some modest adjustments I have made to Landolt’s published standard errors. The name

“Landolt system,” unmodified, will mean that in the *UBV* bandpasses I have formed the weighted average of results taken from Landolt (1992) and Landolt (1973) after the latter have had small ($\lesssim 0.002$ mag) zero-point adjustments applied; these offsets have been determined by direct comparison of the results for stars common to the two publications. The “Landolt system” is also augmented by a very few stars from Landolt (1983) which did not reappear in the 1992 publication. “Present photometry” or “my photometry” will refer to the net results of my current analysis of the 649 datasets considered here, individually referred to the Landolt system as accurately as I can do it. These data, averaged together with Landolt’s for stars in common, were posted to my Web site on January 27, 2005. However, in what follows “the posted photometry” or some equivalent phrase will refer to my photometric indices derived from 594 datasets as of September 28, 2004 (likewise averaged with Landolt’s for stars in common). These are what were available through my Web site when Saha et al. submitted their paper. “Primary standards” refers to the average of my results with Landolt’s for stars in his standard lists; “secondary standards” refers to stars not observed by Landolt that satisfy my acceptance criteria based on my data alone.

5.1. Was the posted photometry on the Landolt system?

The short answer is, not entirely, although I thought it was.

CCDAVE—the program that applies the derived calibration equations to convert instrumental-system magnitudes to the standard system—is not given any prior information about the star’s expected standard-system magnitudes. It is provided with only the measured instrumental CCD magnitudes and the numerical values of the coefficients in the various datasets’ transformation equations. Therefore I can test the software by giving it the instrumental magnitudes for the standard stars as if they were program stars. If CCDAVE returns values very close to the tabulated standard values for those stars, then

it means that CCDSTD has adequately evaluated the coefficients in the transformation equations and has thus defined a good mapping between the instrumental and standard systems. It also means that CCDAVE is capable of correctly applying those transformations in the reverse sense. A failure of *either* either of those steps would make it extremely unlikely for the output of CCDAVE to agree with the input to CCDSTD for most stars. Since CCDAVE has no way of knowing whether a given star is a standard or a program object, if the transformations and the software work correctly for the standards they should also work correctly for the rest.

In the past, I have used plots like that presented here as Fig. 1 to satisfy myself that my software and derived coefficients were adequate to transform the available instrumental magnitudes for Landolt’s stars to his standard system (*cf.*, for instance, HP-II, Figs. 1–4; HP-III, Figs. 2 and 3). The present figure compares the results of my analysis (as of September 28, 2004) of the observational data for Landolt’s standards from 594 datasets to Landolt’s published magnitudes for the same stars. In the figure I have plotted the *posted* minus *Landolt* magnitude differences in B , V , R , and I versus $B-I$ color for all stars meeting the following conditions: at least four Landolt observations and a standard error of the mean Landolt magnitude not greater than 0.03 mag, *and* at least four observations under photometric conditions and a standard error of the mean magnitude not greater than 0.03 mag in my results, *and* no evidence within my data of intrinsic variability in excess of 0.05 mag, r.m.s. Photometric differences are plotted for 230 stars in B , 261 in V , 144 in R , and 163 in I , and the error bars represent a $\pm 1\sigma$ standard error of the mean centered on the observed difference. The $B-I$ colors are the average of Landolt’s and my results, and the error bars include both Landolt’s tabulated standard errors and my own added in quadrature. The standard deviation of the magnitude residuals is 0.015 mag in B , 0.012 mag in V , 0.017 mag in R , and 0.017 mag in I , which are all larger than would be expected from the claimed measurement uncertainties. In order to explain the amount of

scatter in these magnitude differences, I have to assume that a “cosmic” star-to-star scatter is present in addition to the random measurement uncertainties claimed by Landolt and me: this cosmic scatter is 0.010 mag in B , 0.008 mag in V , 0.011 mag in R , and 0.013 mag in I . These additional dispersions are not included in the error bars shown in the figure.

These data suggest that my magnitudes are on the Landolt system to a high level of accuracy: the absolute value of the weighted mean difference is ≤ 0.6 mmag and the standard error of the mean difference is ≤ 1.4 mmag in all four filters. In preparing the photometry for posting on the internet, my next step has always been to apply these mean magnitude differences (≤ 0.6 mmag in the present instance) as additive offsets to my derived standard-system magnitudes to place them truly on the Landolt system in the mean. I then take weighted averages of Landolt’s and my magnitudes for each star in common, and these are made available to the community. However, there is no magic about requiring at least four observations and no more than 0.03 mag of uncertainty; I could as easily compare, for instance, stars with a minimum of eight measurements and no more than 0.02 mag of uncertainty in each sample. In this case, I find a mean magnitude difference in V of +0.6 mmag based on 174 stars, and a difference in I of -1.0 mmag based on 116 stars. Conversely, if I accept stars with two observations and uncertainties of 0.05 mag, the differences are -0.3 mmag (383 stars) and -3.0 mmag (235 stars). Similar changes to the comparison could be made by choosing a different but still reasonable weighting scheme: for instance, by assuming a common cosmic dispersion of 0.010 mag in all four filters. Since the selection criteria for acceptable standards and the details of the weighting scheme are arbitrary, it is not clear that “Landolt’s system” is even defined to a level better than a few millimagnitudes, and it is certainly not meaningful to claim to be on it to an accuracy better than that.

Unfortunately, this turns out not to be the whole story.

Spurred by the Saha et al. paper, I investigated more deeply. In particular, I binned these magnitude differences for stars in intervals of 0.50 mag of $B-I$ color, and determined the unweighted median difference within each bin. The results are shown in Fig. 2. Here the error bars represent a robust measure of the dispersion of the magnitude differences within each bin: $\sqrt{\pi/2}$ times the mean absolute deviation. If the distribution of the magnitude differences were Gaussian in form, this would equal the standard Gaussian σ . Please note that this represents the spread of the residuals in each bin; in most cases error bars representing the standard error of the median difference in a bin would be smaller than the dot itself. (Note also that the reddest bin contains only a single star—Landolt 110 273—and I have no acceptable B magnitude for this star. Landolt observed this star only five times, so its data are not much better than the minimum acceptable quality: if my acceptance criteria were only a little more stringent, this star would not be included. My own results for it are highly concordant: the r.m.s. dispersion in the measured magnitudes, above and beyond the estimated random measuring errors, is only 0.004 mag based on a total of 170 individual measurements in the various filters.) It is evident that there is a substantial trend in the I -band residual as a function of a star’s color, with perhaps weaker trends in the other photometric bandpasses.

Evidently color-scale errors have crept into my broad-band magnitude systems as, over the years, I have transformed various observing runs’ data to the Landolt system, averaged my results with Landolt’s for stars in common and created new secondary standards based on my data alone, used the expanded standard list to recalibrate existing datasets, and added new datasets to the expanding corpus of observations. I have no idea when or how the error occurred; one possibility is a typographical error in an earlier version of my hand-typed catalog of Landolt’s standard indices; I have discovered and corrected a few such blunders over the years. (The use of robust statistical methods prevents such gross errors from having a disastrous effect on the final results—a disastrous effect would

have revealed the mistake—but much more subtle effects, such as this one, *might* still have resulted from such an error.) However it entered, since the total number of my photometric measurements now greatly exceeds the number of Landolt observations, such a scale error—once established in my magnitude system—became self-sustaining. In the case of ΔI versus $B-I$, a more sophisticated fitting procedure applied to the data indicates that the size of the effect is $0.007 \text{ mag mag}^{-1}$, as illustrated by the dashed line in the bottom panel of Fig. 2. A similar, perhaps weaker, trend also appears to be present in V and possibly in the other filters.

For the rest of this paper and for the current and future releases of my standard-star data, I will remove any net offsets and trends with color from my results by brute force as follows. Using only those stars meeting the above-stated acceptance criteria (four observations and standard errors of the mean magnitude $\leq 0.03 \text{ mag}$ in *both* samples, and no evidence of variability in excess of 0.05 mag) I average Landolt’s and my results and calculate all possible simple color indices involving a given bandpass. For instance, I carry out a weighted fit of the differences ΔI to low-order polynomials in as many of $U-I$, $B-I$, $V-I$, and $R-I$ as are defined, given the above selection constraints. (In all my work to date, I have carried U -band magnitudes along in the process whenever available. However, I have not released these results to the community because I do not believe them to be competitive with Landolt’s published indices.) Then for each star, an unweighted average of the available predicted values of ΔI is applied to my derived result to place it more accurately on the Landolt system. I must consider all possible colors because not all bandpasses are available for all the secondary standard stars; for any given star I compute the mean correction based upon the indices that I have. Similar corrections are derived and applied to the other photometric bandpasses.

After torquing my results back to the Landolt system, I freed any color terms that

had previously been fixed for particular datasets, and re-ran CCDSTD to compute new transformations for all the observed data. Fig. 3 shows the current bin-averaged residuals that result from the latest round of reductions for 649 datasets. Whatever the remaining residual differences between my magnitude systems and Landolt’s it is clear that they are not easily described by low-order polynomials in color.

Between September 2004 and January 2005, I have added 55 additional datasets to my sample—including two with observations of NGC 2419—and defined 2,124 additional standard stars in various fields. These have been added to the body of data used to retroactively recalibrate my standard sequences, including that in NGC 2419. Fig. 4 plots the resulting differences between the January 2005 and September 2004 values of the V and I magnitudes of the NGC 2419 sequence on a star-by-star basis, in the sense (January 2005) minus (September 2004), versus $V-I$ color. Each error bar represents a ± 1 standard error of the mean magnitude of a particular star at *either* epoch: that is, the September 2004 estimated standard errors and the January 2005 standard errors have been added in quadrature and divided by $\sqrt{2}$ to obtain a representative uncertainty for each star. Here a systematic linear change in the V -magnitude system is also evident, with an amplitude similar to that in I . This means that my $V-I$ colors for stars redder than $V-I \approx 0.5$ have hardly changed. The correction applied here to any individual star consistently exceeds my claimed standard errors only for stars redder than $V-I \sim 1.5$, although I admit that this is comparing a systematic effect to random uncertainties: the magnitude *system* has certainly changed by more than my previous estimate of its uncertainty.

Considering the standard system as a whole, including stars bluer than the bluest of the NGC 2419 sequence, the systematic change reaches extreme values of $\Delta I = -0.017$ mag and $+0.022$ mag for stars of extreme color, $V-I \sim -0.35$ and $V-I \sim 2.65$, respectively (corresponding roughly to $B-V$ values of -0.3 and $+2.3$, or stars bluer than spectral class

B0 and redder than M8). The absolute value of the correction is < 0.005 mag for the most common stars with $0.6 < V-I < 1.4$ ($0.5 < B-V < 1.2$), and within the same limits the r.m.s. correction is about 0.003 mag. This latter color range contains more than half (57%) of the Landolt standards and presumably a larger fraction of nearby stars, since Landolt made a particular effort to include stars with extreme colors in his sample. Furthermore, when stars of all colors are considered, the root-mean-square systematic error due to the erroneous color slopes in the September 2004 posted data amounts to a bit less than 0.008 mag; this is smaller than the ~ 0.013 mag cosmic star-to-star scatter in the I -band differences found by Stetson, Bruntt & Grundahl and found again above in this paper. Therefore this is not the main component of the scatter that we attributed to “bandpass mismatch,” which continues to dominate the Stetson *versus* Landolt differences over nearly all of the color range. It should also be remembered that my posted magnitudes for the *primary* standards were the average of my results with Landolt’s, so for researchers employing those stars, at least, the effect of my calibration error would have been further diluted. My secondary standards, however, included the mistake at full strength.

The color-slope errors in my September 2004 posted data cannot be the sole, or even the main, explanation for the difference between my I -band magnitudes and those of Saha et al., which were ~ 0.04 mag in the middle color range where the present correction has negligible effect. Abi Saha has very kindly provided me with electronic copies of his main data tables. The (x, y) coordinates included in them enable me to match my stars up with his on a star-by-star basis. Fig. 5 shows the V -band and I -band magnitude differences for the NGC2419 stars in the sense (posted September 2004) minus (Saha) as a function of $V-I$ color. The $\pm 1\sigma$ error bars are the result of adding Saha’s estimated standard errors in quadrature with mine, which somewhat overestimates their size: since the data I have analysed for NGC 2419 includes all the images used by Saha et al., any error sources that are intrinsic to the images themselves (*e.g.*, photon noise and flat-fielding errors) will have

been included twice. However, I have no way of knowing what fraction of the error budget comes from those sorts of problems, and how much from differences in the analysis, such as the estimation of the sky brightness, the removal of the effects of neighboring stars, and the treatment of the transformation from instrumental to standard magnitudes. Therefore, all I can say is that the error bars should be somewhere between 0.7 and 1.0 times the length shown; a factor near 1.0 is much more probable than one near 0.7.

In comparison, Fig. 6 shows the NGC 2419 magnitude differences for (January 2005) minus (Saha). In both plots, I have included all stars with at least four measurements and $\sigma(\text{magnitude}) \leq 0.03 \text{ mag}$ in both datasets. In each filter the main ridgeline of the data has rotated so that the differences now pass through zero near $V-I \sim 2.0$ and the center of gravity of the bluest stars is now slightly less positive, compared to before. However, the net offset of $\Delta I \sim 0.02\text{--}0.04 \text{ mag}$ for the vast majority of stars in the center of the color range has not changed much. Taking the sample as a whole, my calculated mean differences with respect to Saha et al. are -0.0092 mag in V and -0.0268 mag in I for the September 2004 results, and -0.0049 mag in V and -0.0211 mag in I for the January 2005 results. My previous color-scale error thus accounts for about 0.005 mag in each filter, or half the mean discrepancy in V and 20% of the mean discrepancy in I averaged over all colors.

5.2. Is the present photometry for NGC 2419 on the standard system?

To transform the instrumental magnitudes measured for the program stars to the standard system, I employ precisely the same lines of code that successfully transform instrumental magnitudes to standard-system magnitudes for the stars in Landolt’s list. If there were any systematic errors due to intrinsic differences between the secondary standards and the Landolt standards (for instance, an unrecognized photometric nonlinearity in the detector operating on the comparative faintness of the program stars relative to the

Landolt standards) these should tend to average out over the 649 different observational datasets. The systematic error would then show up when the data from an offending run are compared to the average of all runs. I continually look for such effects as I reduce the data. To survive as a serious problem, any such systematic error would have to be consistent across many observing runs using many cameras on many telescopes.

To investigate this issue I have compared my present results from the 616 datasets that do not contain any observations of NGC 2419 on the one hand to the 33 datasets that do contain observations of NGC 2419 on the other. Note that any given observing run could potentially contribute datasets to both of these subsamples if NGC 2419 was observed on some nights of the run and not on others. Again I consider all stars (Landolt standards and secondary standards) with at least four observations under photometric conditions and standard errors of the mean magnitude not greater than 0.03 mag in *each* of the two subsamples, as well as no evidence of intrinsic variability in excess of 0.05 mag, r.m.s., when all observations are considered together. A total of 1,897; 3,587; 1,807; and 3,343 stars meet these selection criteria in *B*, *V*, *R*, and *I*. Note that the NGC 2419 standard sequence itself is *not* included in this comparison since by design the first sample contains no observations of those stars. The comparison is based on the *other* primary and secondary standard stars that have been observed on the same nights and in the same manner as the NGC 2419 secondary standards.

The standard deviation of the differences in the mean magnitudes of the without-2419 versus with-2419 datasets is 0.017 mag per star in *V* and 0.020 mag in *I*. To explain the size of these differences I have to assume that a star-to-star cosmic scatter of order 0.010 mag in *V* and 0.012 mag in *I* is present in addition to the estimated uncertainties of the raw magnitude measurements. As discussed before, these could be the result of subtle differences in spectral energy distributions as perceived by different filter/detector combinations. The

mean differences between the not-2419 and the 2419 datasets are $+1.3 \pm 0.3$ mmag in V and $+3.8 \pm 0.3$ mmag in I , in the sense that the results of the with-2419 runs are brighter in both V and I . I was initially surprised by the size of these differences, but I suppose they are still acceptable. *My experience is that the results for any given field from any given night of CCD observations can be systematically in error by ~ 0.02 mag.* Only 24 of the 33 NGC 2419 datasets were reduced in “photometric weather” mode (Eq. 1) and so were capable of constraining the absolute zero-points of the magnitude scales, and of these only 16 included I -band data: $0.02/\sqrt{16} \approx 5$ mmag, so the not-2419 versus 2419 difference of 3.8 mmag in I is still within the expected standard error of the mean.

The previous section has shown that the inherent scatter in star-by-star plots can mask real trends in the data. Therefore, Fig. 7 plots the *median* magnitude differences between the 616 datasets that do not contain observations of NGC 2419 and the 33 datasets that do. The stars have been divided into 1.0-mag intervals of V magnitude and the unweighted median magnitude differences in B , V , R , and I have been plotted against the mean V magnitude in each bin. Appreciable differences are seen in the faintest two bins in B , which contain, respectively, eight and three stars that must have been near the detection limit in many of the datasets where they appear. The brightest points in B and I are also off, but this bin contains precisely one star, Landolt’s 98 653 at $V = 9.53$, which may have been close to saturation in many of the frames included in one sample or the other. Apart from those exceptions the plots are quite flat, rarely deviating from zero by as much as 0.01 mag over a range of 10 or 11 magnitudes.

The data for the I bandpass do suggest that there may be a slight difference in the magnitude systems for the NGC 2419 nights as compared to the non-2419 nights. Only 355 of the 616 non-2419 datasets included observations in the I filter and, as already noted, only 26 of the 33 datasets including observations of NGC 2419 had I -band data. Assuming

that the average results from 355 datasets are closer to a linear magnitude system than the results from 26, the sense of the difference is that faint stars ($15 < V < 21$) have in general been measured too bright compared to brighter ones on those nights when NGC 2419 was observed. This is in the sense found by Saha et al.: that I measure faint stars in NGC 2419 brighter than they do. Dividing the magnitude differences into two bins, respectively brighter and fainter than $V = 15$, and counting only those stars with acceptable measurements in both V and I in both datasets, in the brighter bin the median magnitude difference in I is -0.002 mag (336 stars) and in the fainter bin it is $+0.005$ mag (2,720 stars). In both bins the median difference is 0.000 mag in V , for the same numbers of stars.

If this effect is real, it *could* therefore account for an additional 0.007 mag portion of the offset noted by Saha et al., except for the fact that the 26 with-2419 datasets having I -band data include 13 from the WIYN 3.5m and 0.9m telescopes. Figs. 8 and 9 indicate that the WIYN data participate in the bright/faint zero-point difference: in the WIYN data the median magnitude difference brighter than $V = 15$ is -0.001 mag, and fainter than $V = 15$ it is $+0.011$ mag. In comparison, for the non-WIYN datasets that include NGC 2419 observations, the corresponding median differences are -0.006 mag and $+0.003$ mag. If the I -band nonlinearity is present in the WIYN instrumentation or observing conditions, it should affect the analysis performed by Saha et al. as well as mine. If, on the other hand, the nonlinearity is an artifact of my data processing, it is hard to see why it would affect primarily the I band on those nights when NGC 2419 was observed, and not the other filters on those same nights or the I filter on other nights. A similar effect is *not* seen in the aggregate data for B , V , or R (Fig. 7), which reduces the likelihood that the bright-faint nonlinearity in I is the result of a defect common to several different cameras, or a minor bug in the reduction software. Perhaps it is a fluke of finite-number statistics and should be ignored. In fact, these data show very little evidence for a simple nonlinearity of the detector response from the NGC 2419 nights as compared to the non-2419 nights: such nonlinearity

would normally be expected to grow exponentially toward bright magnitudes since at faint magnitude levels the small flux difference between the (star+sky) measurement and the (sky) measurement offers little lever arm for a nonlinearity to act upon.

Fig. 10 shows the median magnitude differences between the non-2419 nights and the NGC 2419 nights binned by $V-I$ color. Again I have considered only stars with at least four observations under photometric conditions and standard errors of the mean magnitude not greater than 0.03 mag in *both* of the two samples, as well as no evidence of intrinsic variability in excess of 0.05 mag, r.m.s., when all observations are considered together. Apart from the very reddest stars, it is evident that the color terms in the transformations are as well controlled on the NGC 2419 nights as they are on the non-NGC 2419 nights. Anent the reddest stars, Landolt himself lists only six stars with $V-I$ colors redder than 3.50, and one of these—98 L5—has claimed uncertainties > 0.10 mag in both V and $V-I$, while another—92 427—was observed only twice on a single night. These two therefore hardly count as standard stars. Of the other four very red Landolt standards, G3-33, G12-43, G156-31, and G45-20, only the last has observations in my database: four CCD images consisting of one in V and one in I from each of two different observing runs, one of which was photometric and the other of which was not, and neither of which included NGC 2419. Therefore all the stars redder than $V-I \approx 3$ that are plotted here or discussed elsewhere in this paper rely heavily upon extrapolation of the color transformations. Consequently it is not surprising that their absolute colors are somewhat vaguely defined. For completeness, I should note that the reddest three bins for the R bandpass contain, respectively, two, one, and one stars; the large scatter seen here is therefore not a major cause for concern. Another thing to note is that the I -band magnitudes of very blue stars are particularly hard to define consistently, as indicated by the large dispersion (error bars) in the bluest few bins. This effect has been seen before (*e.g.*, Stetson, Bruntt & Grundahl 2003, Fig. 3).

5.3. Are there any problems specific to the WIYN datasets?

The remainder of this section will concern itself primarily with the data from the WIYN 3.5m telescope, because the WIYN 0.9m data carry relatively little of the weight in determining the mean photometric indices for the faint NGC 2419 standards.

5.3.1. Magnitude/exposure-time effect?

When I carefully examined the photometric residuals from the CCDSTD reduction of the primary and secondary standard stars observed with the WIYN 3.5m telescope, I noticed an offset between the residuals of the bright—primary and secondary standards in a ratio of about 1:15—and faint—entirely secondary—standards. For example, Fig. 11 shows ΔV *versus* V (left-hand panels) and ΔI *versus* I (right) for chip 1 (top panels) and chip 2 (bottom) of MiniMos from the initial reductions of the “wiyn3” datasets from the 3.5m telescope. The sense of the differences is observed instrumental magnitude as measured from the CCD image *minus* the instrumental magnitude that is predicted by Eq. 1 above, using the known standard-system magnitudes of the stars and the best-fitting values of the color-transformation and extinction coefficients. In each case, the fitting residuals appear to define two distinct clumps, each one flaring out with larger dispersions toward fainter magnitudes. However, in each panel the clump that contains the majority of the apparently bright photometric standards is systematically shifted toward negative numbers: these stars’ instrumental magnitudes have been measured too small (too bright) compared to most of the fainter standards. Within each clump, there is no obvious tendency for the centroid of the magnitude residuals to vary systematically with apparent magnitude; rather the appearance is that the brighter standards have been translated in bulk toward negative fitting residuals.

In the “wiyn3” observing run, this effect appears to be roughly consistent for both chips and both filters, but it does not appear to be strictly constant from run to run: for

instance, Fig. 12 shows the corresponding residuals from initial reductions of the “wyn4” run. It is not obvious to the eye, but when actual weighted averages are calculated in this dataset the effect is found to be in the opposite sense to that observed in “wyn3”, with the brighter stars having more positive residuals in “wyn4”; a hint of this is perceptible in the bottom right panel. A similar effect is *not* seen in most of the other datasets that include observations of NGC 2419: for instance, the three-night observing run that I have labeled “abi36,” carried out by Abi Saha on the WIYN 0.9m telescope, shows no obvious systematic offset between the bright standards and the faint ones: Fig. 13 illustrates 8,240 fitting residuals in V and 9,580 fitting residuals in I from all observations of primary and secondary standards on the three nights. Similar plots could be produced from the remaining datasets. The variability of the bright/faint offset from run to run and from telescope to telescope suggests that this is not a general systematic problem within the secondary standard system itself.

Figs. 14 and 15 demonstrate that the problem could be viewed as relating to exposure time rather than to apparent magnitude. Again, residuals in V are shown in the left panels and I on the right, and chip 1 is at the top and chip 2 is at the bottom. This time, the abscissa is exposure time displayed on a logarithmic scale. Each short, thin horizontal line represents the photometric residual from a single observation of a primary or secondary standard star. These figures show the same stars as are illustrated in Figs. 11 and 12, but since the exposure times are quantized here there is a much greater overlap of points than in the previous figures. A longer, heavier line shows the value of the median photometric residual at each distinct exposure time. In every panel for the “wyn3” run, the shortest exposures are associated with the most negative residuals, on average. The longer exposure times, especially those represented by many different standard-star observations, have more consistent fitting residuals. For the “wyn4” run (Fig. 15), again the trend is not obvious in the V band data, where the shortest exposure time was 6 s, but it is perceptible in the

I-band data, where the shortest exposure was 3 s. And again, when suitable weighted averages are taken, it is found that overall the shortest exposures in the “winy4” datasets have more positive residuals than the longer exposures, on average.

I found that these trends could be removed to first order by assuming that the exposure times were not exactly the values given in the image headers. For instance, if I assume that for the run “winy3” all exposures are 0.06 s longer than the integer number of seconds given in the image headers, I could remove the net difference between the median residual of the shortest exposures and the median residual from all exposures of 20 s or greater, when data from both chips and all filters are considered simultaneously. In the case of the “winy4” data, the offset was removed by assuming that the exposures were 0.05 s *shorter* than indicated in the image headers. For the “winy2” dataset the estimated adjustment was +0.02 s; for the observing that I have named run “winyb”—which included no observations of NGC 2419—the correction was +0.04 s; and for “winyc” it was +0.02 s. The effect thus ranges from stars in the shortest exposures being measured 0.02 mag too faint (the shortest “winy4” exposures being 2.95 s rather than 3 s) to 0.03 mag too bright (2.06 s *versus* 2 s in “winy3”) when integer-second integrations are assumed. Exposures longer than expected appear to dominate over exposures that were shorter than expected, contributing to a net stretch of the magnitude scale between bright stars and faint in the WIYN 3.5m data. This can lead to a systematic offset in the *V*–*I* colors, since the *I*-band exposures were often shorter than those in *V*. The effect observed here is in the same sense as the *I*-magnitude offset found by Saha et al.: according to them, my *I*-band magnitudes for NGC 2419 stars were too bright by about 0.04 mag, *i.e.*, the flux ratio between my measurements for the bright standard stars and the faint cluster stars was too small, compared to theirs.

The net effect of altering the exposure times, when averaged over all exposure times and applied to all primary- and secondary-standard star observations, has little influence on

my photometric results: when the calibrated photometry from all the WIYN 3.5m observing runs is combined, and adjusting only the photometric zero-points without altering the estimated color or extinction terms, the net effect of going from integer- to fractional-second exposure times is to brighten my V results for NGC 2419 by 1.3 mmag and I by 1.4 mmag (and 1.6 mmag in B and 0.7 mmag in R). The smallness of these changes is due to the predominant weight carried by the large number of secondary standard stars that were measured in comparatively long-exposure images. Results based upon the fractional-second exposure times are what I have discussed in the previous section of this paper.

However, Saha et al. did not use the secondary standards available in the Landolt fields or the program fields that they observed: they based their calibrations on only Landolt (1992) standards—all observed in short-exposure images—and applied those calibrations to program objects in long-exposure images. To estimate the size of the exposure time effect under these circumstances, I reperformed the calibration of the WIYN 3.5m photometric data. This time I employed only the Landolt (1992) standards to derive the transformations, and again I enforced the color transformations and extinction slopes that I had derived from the full set of primary and secondary standard observations, leaving only the zero-points to be determined by the software. In this case, going from the integer-second integration times to the fractional-second integrations caused the calibrated photometry for NGC 2419 to brighten by 0.015 mag in V and 0.017 mag in I . This accounts for most of the 0.021 mag discrepancy that remained between my results and those of Saha et al. after correcting the color-slope error of my results posted in September 2004.

None of this demonstrates that there was an actual problem with the timing of the camera shutter on the WIYN telescope. In fact, Saha et al. direct their readers’ attention to tests indicating that the MiniMos shutter is accurate to 0.2% for exposures as short as 0.3 s. This implies an absolute accuracy of $600\,\mu\text{sec}$ in the shutter mechanism after

correcting for known software delays. (The document cited itself says only, “Over the entire effective range of exposure times from 0.2 s to 10 s, no effective non-linearity is seen at the one percent level,” on the basis of experiments conducted with the flat-field lamp. It is not stated whether these tests were carried out on more than one occasion, at more than one temperature, with the telescope in various positions, or with the shutter being exercised after varied periods of inactivity.) Fudging the exposure times is merely a numerical kludge that empirically removes an observed trend, much as a low-order polynomial in some color index is presumed to calibrate away filter-bandpass mismatch. Nor can I argue that a single alteration to the integration time is appropriate for all exposures from a given night of observations. This merely appears to remove the net trend on average; any variation in whatever is causing the effect contributes to the random errors remaining in the results. Saha et al. would have had great difficulty in detecting this effect, whatever it is, since they based their calibrations solely on bright standards in short-exposure images.

5.3.2. Color effects?

In reducing the WIYN 3.5m data, I found strong evidence for trends in the calibration that were quadratic in the color term. Specifically, the top panel of Fig. 16 contains the residual *I*-band magnitude differences between my current adopted magnitudes and the average results derived from the WIYN 3.5m data alone for all primary and secondary standards observed during those observing runs (including “wiybn”, which provided no observations of NGC 2419) when the best linear calibration is employed:

$$i \sim I - 0.050(\pm 0.002)(V-I).$$

Here I have plotted residuals for 1,533 distinct primary and secondary standard stars having at least four observations and $\sigma_I \leq 0.03$ mag in the WIYN 3.5m datasets. This may be compared to the Saha et al. calibration for one of the chips (not specified) from the run I

have named “wiyn2”:

$$I \sim i - 0.024(v-i)$$

based upon 22 observations of Landolt (1992) standards. Saha et al. obtained an independent color transformation for each chip on each night. Fig. 3 above indicates that my I -band magnitudes are now on the Landolt system for $-0.6 < B-I < +5.5$, which corresponds to $-0.3 < V-I < 2.9$ (the effective limits of the color range well sampled by Landolt standards). Thus, the extreme curvature seen at the red end is largely inferred from secondary standards whose colors have been extrapolated beyond Landolt’s limits. However, these data represent the average of many different extrapolations with many different CCDs and filters, not all of which required quadratic color terms. Even within the range spanned by the Landolt standards, the offsets seen in the upper panel of Fig. 16 at $V-I < 0.5$ and $2.0 < V-I < 3.0$ are real and statistically highly significant.

The lower panel shows the corresponding residuals for the posted standard stars from my best-fitting quadratic calibration:

$$i \sim I - 0.0106(\pm 0.0012)(V-I) - 0.0133(\pm 0.0012)(V-I)^2.$$

Similarly, my best-fitting transformation curve for all the other filters in the WIYN 3.5m data were

$$\begin{aligned} b &\sim B + 0.028(\pm 0.008)(B-V) - 0.033(\pm 0.013)(B-V)^2, \\ v &\sim V - 0.010(\pm 0.002)(V-I) + 0.001(\pm 0.001)(V-I)^2, \text{ and} \\ r &\sim R + 0.043(\pm 0.005)(V-R) - 0.053(\pm 0.029)(V-R)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which may be compared to the relations in Saha et al., Eqs. 5–8. The chip-to-chip and run-to-run differences in these coefficients were small, $< \pm 0.004$ in a root-mean-square sense, so I concluded it was adequate to assign a common color transformation to all the datasets. If this simplification is invalid, it means that for some datasets the color slope

has been underestimated while for others it has been overestimated. In this case, in some datasets the reddest stars will be calibrated too bright and in others they will be calibrated too faint. The net deleterious effect of the oversimplification will largely average out for stars measured in many different observing runs so—even if it is unjustified—it is not likely to cause major systematic errors in the final standard list, especially for stars of neutral color.

For comparison, Fig. 17 shows the corresponding residuals for only the Landolt (1992) standards when the average linear and quadratic fits are imposed on all the WIYN 3.5m observing runs. (These linear and quadratic fits are the same ones discussed in the previous two paragraphs, and were performed on the basis of all current primary and secondary standards, not on the basis of Landolt standards only. However, here I have plotted the fitting residuals in the sense Landolt’s published photometry minus the values that I obtain from my data only for stars in common.) Here I have placed no restrictions on the number of observations or the size of the uncertainties, except that I have omitted the extremely red star Landolt 98 L5, for which Landolt (1992) gives $V = 17.80$ and $V-I = 5.80$ with large uncertainties, based on six observations per filter from three nights. My own observations (12 in B , 98 in V , 38 in R and 79 in I) suggest that this star is a variable at a level of some 0.23 mag (r.m.s.). Saha et al. would not have known this, but it is clear that they omitted the star anyway (it is patently absent from their Fig. 12, for instance), probably because of its large published uncertainties. This plot does include a number of other stars that I would not have used as primary standards (Landolt’s stars 98 102, 98 634, 98 642, 98 646, 98 652, 101 262, 104 244, 104 339, 104 12, 110 362, 110 L1, and 113 L1), because Landolt himself observed them fewer than five times each. Without the eye of faith, it would be hard to distinguish which of these fits is better. However, a close look does indicate that the half dozen bluest stars and the half dozen reddest stars are skewed toward positive residuals in the top panel.

5.3.2. Small-number effects?

Note that, apart from Landolt star 98 L5, Fig. 17 contains the average photometric results for every Landolt standard observed on either CCD of the mosaic from all WIYN 3.5m observing runs combined. The number of stars observed on a given chip on a given night will be much smaller than indicated here. The question remains: given the circumstances, which is better, to impose mean extinction coefficients and mean color transformations on the different chips and observing runs, or to determine the extinction and color transformations separately for each CCD on every night? Saha et al. have illustrated their photometric residuals for Landolt standards from all nights considered together in their Figs. 13 and 14. However, these plots do not give a good sense of the number and distribution of residuals from a given night on a single chip.

In Fig. 18 I show my weighted mean fitting residuals for the V -band standard-star images against airmass for each of the five photometric WIYN 3.5m nights, including “wiynb” when NGC 2419 was not observed. To reduce crowding, each point represents the weighted average fitting residual for all primary and secondary standards contained in a single CCD image, and small filled circles are for chip 1 in the mosaic camera, while large empty circles are for chip 2. As before, residuals are defined in the sense observed instrumental magnitude as measured from the CCD image minus the value predicted from Eq. 1. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean residual. The number in the lower right corner of each panel indicates the total number of individual standard-star measurements (chips 1 and 2 combined) that are represented by the points. Fig. 19 is the corresponding plot for the I -band observations.

In performing these reductions, I concluded that night “wiyn2” was perceptibly clearer than the others: for this night I derived a weighted B -band extinction coefficient of $0.20 \text{ mag airmass}^{-1}$, which scaled to 0.11 in V , and 0.07 in I according to the standard

extinction ratios given above (no R -band data were taken that night). For the other four nights my estimated site-mean extinction coefficients were judged to be adequate: 0.24 in B , 0.14 in V , and 0.09 in I . The degree of validity of these judgments is indicated by the figures.

On the night named “wiync,” of all the observations in $BVRI$ there are five CCD images whose absolute mean residuals are greater than 0.1 mag. Fig. 20 shows, at a compressed scale, the mean residuals in all four filters plotted as a function of the time of night. Again, the error bars represent the formal standard errors of the weighted mean residuals. There are two bad images in the R filter that were taken just before 6:00 o’clock; these come from a single exposure with chips 1 and 2 of the Landolt standard field Ru149, and contain 194 and 59 primary and secondary standards, respectively (counting only Landolt’s primary standard stars, there are eight and zero in the two chips). There is a pair of bad images in the V filter taken just before 10:00 o’clock resulting from a single exposure of the Pal 4 program field; these images contain 64 and one secondary standards, respectively (there are no primary standards in the Pal 4 field). Finally, there is one bad B -band image; this is a chip 1 image containing a single secondary standard from the same visit to Pal 4 as the two bad V -band exposures. The chip 2 image from the same exposure is marginally discrepant, with a weighted mean residual of $+0.045 \pm 0.005$ mag based upon 70 secondary standards. I have no way of knowing why these particular images are anomalous. The other 99 images in B , V , R , and I from both CCDs on that night are basically fine, although there may be some other subtle indications that night “wiync” might not have been completely photometric: Fig. 20 shows some evidence of instability from the beginning of the night until 6:00 or 6:30, and Figs. 18 and 19 show slightly enhanced scatter in the “wiync” data compared to the other nights. At this point, the astronomer must make a binary decision, whether to ignore the discrepant images and treat the rest of night “wiync” as photometric, or to reduce the night’s data in non-photometric mode; both Saha et al.

and I have taken the former approach.

For comparison, in Figs. 21 and 22 I illustrate the frame-averaged fitting residuals for the Landolt (1992) standards only. For these reductions I enforced my own estimated values of the quadratic color transformations and extinction coefficients; I have left only the photometric zero-points free to be determined by the fitting procedure. Again, small filled circles represent individual-image weighted mean residuals from chip 1, large empty circles are for chip 2, and the errorbars represent the standard error of the mean residual. The numbers in the lower right corner of each panel represent the number of individual photometric measurements shown in the plot: if a given star has been observed multiple times with a particular chip/filter combination during the night, all the observations are included in the total number count since it may have been observed at different airmasses. It is evident that *if* one chose to determine the extinction coefficients completely freely from these data, it would sometimes be possible to derive quite different values from the ones I have adopted based on the full set of primary and secondary standards. To the extent that the program fields were not observed at precisely the same airmass, on average, as the Landolt standard fields, any indeterminacy in the extinction coefficients could contribute to systematic errors in the calibrated photometry for the science target fields observed on those nights.

Figs. 23, 24, and 25, and 26 address the question of whether it is adequate to use the same color transformation for both chips and all observing runs. In them I have plotted, binned by $V-I$ color, the median residuals of the standard-star observations (primary and secondary standards) separated by observing run (five panels in each plot), and by chip and filter (separate plots). The data are the same as were used for Figs. 18 and 19. Here, as in Figs. 7–10, for instance, the error bars represent the $\pm 1\sigma$ spread in the residuals within each bin; points with no perceptible error bars usually represent only one or two stars. For

instance, the two dots with $V-I > 4.0$ for run “wyn4” in all four figures represent only a single star in each case (secondary standards L110-S96 with $V-I = 4.98$ and L110-S44 with $V-I = 5.27$). The total number of different primary and secondary standards represented in each panel is given in the lower right corner; a star with multiple observations in a given filter/chip combination on a given night is counted only once, since its true color is always the same. One can imagine that there are significant deviations from the zero line in some of the bins. Overall, however, it seems that there is no systematic slope in the well-populated regime, $0.0 \leq V-I \leq 2.5$ in any of the panels, so the adopted constant color transformation appears to do no *serious* injustice to the data from any one chip/filter/date combination.

For comparison, Figs. 27, 28, 29, and 30 show the magnitude differences for only the individual Landolt (1992) standards in the various datasets. These figures are based on the same reductions as Figs. 23 through 26: unlike the case with Figs. 21 and 22, they are calibrated using my zero-points as well as my estimates of the extinction and color coefficients. However, here I have picked out the final magnitude differences only for Landolt (1992) standards, including those that have fewer than four Landolt observations or published standard errors larger than 0.03 mag. Since these plots are not crowded, I have not plotted median residuals in color bins; each point represents the net magnitude difference for a single Landolt star—the nightly average difference if the star was observed more than once with a particular chip/filter combination. The number in the lower right corner of each panel indicates the number of different Landolt stars used in the comparison. It seems that if one were to base the calibration of the data on only these stars and no others, it would be possible in some cases to infer different zero-points and color-transformation slopes than those that I have adopted from the larger sample of primary and secondary standards.

6. SUMMARY

In this paper I have attempted to find explanations for the different *I*-band photometric calibrations between my posted photometric standard values and the results reported by Saha et al. (2005). In the course of this investigation I have discovered and—I hope—largely corrected a systematic error in my *I*-band magnitude system which depended on the temperature of the star. This systematic effect produced maximum errors of about ± 0.02 mag for stars at the extremes of Landolt’s color range: $B-I \sim -0.6$ and $B-I \sim +5.0$, or $V-I \sim -0.35$ and $V-I \sim +2.65$, or $B-V \sim -0.3$ and $B-V \sim +2.3$. Systematic errors in my previously posted magnitudes probably were not in excess of 0.005 mag for the most common stars: those with $0.6 \lesssim V-I \lesssim 1.4$. In this range the average systematic error is close to 0.000 mag, and the root-mean-square contribution to photometric scatter is probably ~ 0.003 mag; over the whole color range, the r.m.s. error is slightly less than 0.008 mag. This mistake is probably responsible for about 20% of the discrepancy noted by Saha et al. I have subsequently done my best to eliminate this part of the anomaly.

In comparing 33 datasets that include observations of NGC 2419 to the photometric results from 649 datasets that do not include data for the cluster, I conclude that the two subsamples are on the same photometric system to $\sim \pm 0.003$ mag, which is consistent with the notion that, even under the best of circumstances, the average results for any one field from any one night of observations—due to anomalous extinction, flat-fielding errors, shutter-timing errors, or whatever—can be systematically incorrect by ~ 0.02 mag, and that these systematic errors can be beaten down by combining many independent nights’ worth of data.

My analysis of the WIYN data has differed from that of Saha et al. in four significant particulars. First, I employed my expanded standard list, which consists of the average of my results from 179 observing runs with Landolt’s results for stars in common, plus an

additional $\sim 4,300$ secondary standards that fell within the WIYN images; Saha et al. used ~ 110 (depending upon the filter) different stars from Landolt (1992). Second, my analysis of the 3.5m data initially produced a systematic difference in the photometric residuals of the bright primary and secondary standards as compared to those of the faint secondary standards. This discrepancy could be removed to first order by making empirical adjustments to the exposure times as recorded in the image headers. The same adjustments corrected the chip 1 and chip 2 residuals and the V - and I -band residuals comparably well, but different adjustments were indicated for different observing runs. Third, my analysis used quadratic color corrections to transform the WIYN instrumental magnitudes from both telescopes to the standard photometric system, while Saha et al. found linear transformations to be adequate. These latter two effects, taken together, account for most of the ~ 0.04 mag discrepancy found by Saha et al. Fourth, I estimated the color and extinction corrections from multiple datasets (different chips, filters, nights) and imposed mutually consistent, constant values for these coefficients on the final photometric reductions.

The necessity for altering the exposure times and adopting quadratic color transformations resulted entirely from my use of the secondary photometric standards in addition to the primary Landolt (1992) standards. Both of these effects are unseen when only the bright Landolt standards are employed. The additional standards do not make the fourth alteration of the reduction protocol *necessary*, but I believe that they demonstrate that the homogenized extinction and color corrections are *adequate*. Short of having Arlo Landolt observe a representative sample of my secondary standards, I have no further proof that my results for the secondary standards are on the Landolt system. However, I have shown that my observations and my software can place my observations of Landolt’s stars on his system, and it is logical to expect that the same lines of code and the same transformation formulae should work equally well on other stars observed with the same

equipment, provided that the systematic errors occasioned by inherent differences between the observations of Landolt standards and the program stars are adequately controlled. To the extent that this latter statement is untrue—if a given CCD is nonlinear, for instance, or if the standard and program stars are not observed at similar times of night or at similar airmasses—one hopes that such failures will average out over many nights with many cameras. When all else fails, more observations are generally better than fewer.

I would like to thank Abi Saha for many stimulating discussions, and I’d like to thank him again and the WIYN observatory staff in general for providing me with their data from six observing runs. I am very grateful to Michael Bolte, Howard Bond, and Nicholas Suntzeff, who also generously donated some of the data that were used in this study. I continue to be very grateful to the Canadian Astronomy Data Centre and the Isaac Newton Group Archive for providing data for this and other ongoing studies.

A. Weighting published photometric indices

To obtain maximum benefit from the combination of observations, it is important to consider the uncertainties of the individual measurements and take them into account by weighting the data appropriately. Assume that a set of measurements, x_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$, are made of some physical quantity, x , with measuring errors that are known to possess accurately Gaussian probability distributions with known standard deviations σ_i . It is an elementary exercise to demonstrate that a maximum-likelihood estimate, $\bar{x}$, of the unknown true value of x is achieved by assigning a weight $w_i \propto \sigma_i^{-2}$ to each individual observation. In the still more simplified case where all the $\sigma_i = \sigma$ —a known, constant value— $\bar{x} = (\sum x_i)/n$, and a $\pm 1\sigma_{\bar{x}} = 68\%$ confidence interval for the average measurement is given by

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2 = \sigma^2/n. \tag{A1}$$

It is similarly elementary, but a different problem, to show that when the standard deviation of the measuring errors, σ , is unknown, but is presumed to be the same for all i , an unbiased estimate of the true standard deviation can be derived from

$$\bar{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}. \quad (A2)$$

It is commonly seen in the astronomical literature that the value of the quantity being sought and the standard deviation of the measuring error are *both* considered to be unknown but constant. In this case the equal-weighted mean quantity $\bar{x}$ is generally calculated as above, the standard deviation of one measurement error is estimated from Eq. (A2), the resulting value of $\bar{\sigma}$ is substituted for σ in Eq. (A1), and the value of $\sigma_{\bar{x}}$ given by

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n(n - 1)} \quad (A3)$$

is published as the $\pm 1\sigma = 68\%$ confidence interval for the true value of x about $\bar{x}$. This procedure is not strictly legitimate, and is significantly wrong for small values of n .

Consider this: if exactly two measurements of some unknown quantity x are obtained, what is the numerical probability that the true value of x lies *between* the two measured values, x_1 and x_2 ? To clarify the discussion, and without loss of generality, we may suppose that $x_1 = 1$ and $x_2 = -1$. Then $\bar{x} = 0$, $\bar{\sigma}^2 = [1^2 + (-1)^2]/(2 - 1) = 2$, and $\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2 = \bar{\sigma}^2/2 = 1$. Therefore 0 ± 1 defines a $\pm 1\sigma = 68\%$ confidence interval for the true value of x . This is not the right answer.

The first of the two measurements is certain to be either greater or smaller than the true value of x ; provided the measuring error is not identically zero, the probability of measuring exactly the right value is nil and an overestimate is just as likely as an underestimate. The second measurement, provided it is statistically independent of the first, also has equal likelihood of being too large or too small. The probability that the second measurement lies on the same side of the true value as the first measurement is precisely 50%, and the

probability that the two measurements straddle the true value is also 50%. In the example given above, the interval 0 ± 1 therefore represents a 50% confidence interval, not 68%.

The problem is that the true value of *neither* x nor σ is known. Both are estimates based upon uncertain data, and when a confidence interval for a result is claimed, it must take into account the fact that *both* $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ are *estimates* based on uncertain data. The complication arises from the fact that, while the likelihood distribution for the true value of x is symmetric about the estimate $\bar{x}$, the likelihood for the true value of σ about $\bar{\sigma}$ is not: if the estimate is $\bar{\sigma} = 1$ it is absolutely impossible that the true value of σ could be 0, but it is quite plausible that the true value could be 2. It is even possible—though unlikely—that the true value of σ could be 10. Therefore, when both $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ are estimated from the same small dataset, the possibility that the measuring errors have been greatly overestimated is slight, but the possibility that they have been underestimated is not negligible.

The confidence interval for the true value of the quantity being sought should be estimated from Student’s t -distribution, not from the Gaussian distribution. When $n = 2$ a 68% confidence interval is equal to $\pm 2\bar{\sigma}$. Many years ago I did a little experimenting with a calculator and convinced myself that the true range of a 68% confidence interval based on Student’s t -distribution is quite well approximated by

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}} = \frac{(n-1)}{(n-1.5)} \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

This is accurate at $n = 2$ and completely correct as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and is wrong by no more than a few percent for intermediate values of n . Since Landolt’s published uncertainties appear to be based on Eq. A3, this correction results in an increase of his error estimates by about 14% when $n = 5$, which is the smallest number of observations I am willing to accept for a fundamental standard star. When I average Landolt’s measurements of a star which he has observed twice with three or more of my own measurements to define a standard star with at least five independent observations, I double his published

error estimate in defining the relative weights. The errors of my own photometry are based on readout noise, photon statistics, and the quality of the profile fits *as well as* on observation-to-observation agreement. Therefore the correction factor that I apply is close to unity if the observation-to-observation agreement is consistent with the other error estimates. If the mean error of unit weight is significantly greater than unity, then I apply a corresponding fraction of the Gauss-to-Student correction.

After the above scaling of the standard errors, I also apply an further additive standard error of $(0.001 \text{ mag})/\sqrt{12}$, in quadrature, to the error estimates to allow for the error induced by Landolt’s having rounded off his published photometric indices to three decimal places. This is a non-negligible effect when the published uncertainty is $\lesssim 0.001 \text{ mag}$, as is often the case for Landolt standards with more than ten or twenty observations.

Finally, for a fair combination of Landolt’s results with my own, I must deal with the fact that he works in colors and I work in magnitudes. That is, Landolt publishes indices and standard errors in V , $B-V$, $V-R$, and $V-I$, for instance, whereas my software operates on B , V , R , and I and their associated standard errors. The reason for the different approach lies in the equipment. With a photomultiplier, it is easy to cycle rapidly and repeatedly through the various filters. If the observing sequence is symmetric, the aggregate observations in the different bandpasses all occur at the same effective mean airmass, and temporal variations in the atmosphere and equipment cancel out in the flux ratios among the various filters as long as they are slow compared to a single integration cycle. Instrumental colors are therefore well defined. With CCD observations, the assumption that the different filters are observed at the same effective airmass and time is harder to justify, and the definition of instrumental colors is therefore problematic. In addition, farther down the reduction pipeline, the efficient combination of results from different nights is more reliable when magnitudes are the coin of the realm: as a particular case in point, CCDAVE

is able to employ the mean of all observations of a given star from *all* datasets in defining the standard-system colors to use in the transformation equations for *each* dataset. When transformations are based on instrumental colors, the color correction appropriate to a given observation is determined from a single pair of error-prone measurements that must be closely matched in time and airmass.

Adopting magnitudes as the fundamental photometric indices necessitates converting Landolt’s standard errors in color to standard errors in magnitude, which cannot be done with full mathematical rigor. For faint stars with observations whose precision is limited by photon statistics, the errors in B and $B-V$, for instance, will be correlated, but the errors in B and V will be uncorrelated. In this case, $\sigma^2(B-V) = \sigma^2(B) + \sigma^2(V)$. At the other extreme, the B and V magnitudes might have their errors dominated by extinction fluctuations, in which case those errors would be highly correlated, while those same fluctuations could cancel out in $B-V$ due to the rapid cycling through the filters. If the errors in magnitude and color are completely uncorrelated, then one would expect that $\sigma^2(B) = \sigma^2(V) + \sigma^2(B-V)$. The usual case will be somewhere between these limits,

$$\text{Max} [0, \sigma^2(B-V) - \sigma^2(V)] \leq \sigma^2(B) \leq \sigma^2(V) + \sigma^2(B-V),$$

and without knowing the correlation coefficient between B and V , not much more can be said. Therefore, I use

$$\sigma^2(B) = \frac{1}{2} [\sigma^2(V) + \sigma^2(B-V)]$$

as my estimate of the standard error of Landolt’s mean B magnitude, with equivalent definitions for the other filters.

REFERENCES

- Bekki, K., & Freeman, K. C. 2003, MNRAS, 346, L11
- Christian, C. A., et al. 1985, PASP, 97, 363
- Cousins, A. W. J. 1976, MmRAS, 81, 25
- Graham, J. A. 1981, PASP, 93, 29
- Graham, J. A. 1982, PASP, 94, 244
- Harris, W. E., et al. 1997, AJ, 114, 1030
- Joner, M. D., & Taylor, B. J. 1990, PASP, 102, 1004
- Kron, G. E., White, H. S., & Gascoigne, S. C. B. 1953, ApJ, 118, 502
- Landolt, A. U. 1973, AJ, 78, 959
- Landolt, A. U. 1983, AJ, 88, 439
- Landolt, A. U. 1992, AJ, 104, 340
- Odewahn, S. C., Bryja, C., & Humphreys, R. M. 1992, PASP, 104, 553
- Saha, A., Dolphin, A. E., Thim F., & Whitmore, B. 2005, PASP, 117, 37
- Schild, R. E. 1983, PASP, 95, 1021
- Stetson, P. B. 1993, in IAU Coll. 136, Stellar Photometry — Current Techniques and Future Developments, ed. C. J. Butler & I. Elliot (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press), 291
- Stetson, P. B. 2000, PASP, 112, 925
- Stetson, P.B., Bruntt, H., & Grundahl, F. 2003, PASP, 115, 413

Stetson, P. B., Hesser, J. E. & Smecker-Hane, T. A. 1998, *PASP*, 110, 533

Stobie, R. S., Sagar, R., & Gilmore, G. 1985, *A&AS*, 60, 503

Taylor, B. J., & Joner, M. D. 1996, *AJ*, 111, 1338

van den Bergh, S., & Mackey, A. D, 2004, *MNRAS*, 354, 713

Walker, A. R., & Suntzeff, N. B. 1990, *PASP*, 102, 131

Walker, A. R., & Suntzeff, N. B. 1991, *PASP*, 103, 958

Willman, B., et al., 2004, *astro-ph/0410416*

Fig. 1.— This figure shows the differences between Landolt’s (1973, 1983, 1992) published photometry and the final results (as of September 2004) of my analysis of 594 photometric datasets. I have plotted magnitude differences only for stars that were observed at least four times by Landolt and had at least four measurements under photometric conditions in my data, had standard errors of the mean magnitude no larger than 0.03 mag in both samples, and showed no evidence of intrinsic variation larger than 0.05 mag, r.m.s., in my data. Each individual Landolt standard star meeting these criteria is represented by an error bar indicating the $\pm 1\sigma$ confidence interval obtained by combining Landolt’s standard error of the mean with mine, in quadrature. Data are plotted for 230 stars in B , 261 in V , 144 in R , and 163 in I .

Fig. 2.— The individual magnitude differences illustrated in Fig. 1 have been binned in 0.5-mag intervals of $B-I$ color, and the median magnitude difference in each bin is designated by a filled circle. The error bars represent $\pm\sqrt{\pi/2}$ times the mean absolute deviation from the median, which is a robust measure of the dispersion of the differences. The I -band data show a clear trend of $\langle\Delta I\rangle$ with color, in the sense that redder stars have more positive values of $I(\text{Landolt})-I(\text{Stetson})$. A straight line fitted to the weighted magnitude differences in I is shown as a dashed curve.

Fig. 3.— As in Fig. 2, this figure shows the median value and the dispersion of the magnitude differences between Landolt’s published results and mine for stars meeting the acceptance criteria, *after* my $BVRI$ magnitude systems have been twisted to match Landolt’s as described in the text. These are the data that were posted to the World-Wide Web in January 2005. The bin $5.0 < B-I < 5.5$ contains only one star. Some differences between Landolt’s magnitude systems and mine as a function of color remain, but they are not well described by low-order polynomials in color.

Fig. 4.— This figure illustrates the difference between my calibrated photometry for

NGC 2419 stars as of September 2004—when my posted data still suffered from the systematic color error illustrated in Fig. 2—and my calibrated photometry as of January 2005, when the systematic error had been reduced to the level shown in Fig. 3. Also, the January 2005 analysis is based on more datasets and more secondary standards than the September 2004 analysis. The upper panel shows ΔV in the sense 2005 *minus* 2004 plotted against $V-I$ color, and the lower panel shows ΔI versus $V-I$. The error bars represent approximate ± 1 standard error of the mean magnitudes at *either* epoch: that is, the September 2004 standard errors and the January 2005 errors have been added in quadrature and divided by $\sqrt{2}$.

Fig. 5.— This figure shows the difference between the published photometry of Saha et al. (2005) and my results according to the September 2004 calibration for NGC 2419 stars meeting the acceptance criteria listed in the text. The upper panel shows ΔV in the sense Stetson *minus* Saha plotted against the average of our two estimates of $V-I$ color. The bottom panel shows ΔI versus $V-I$. The error bars are the result of adding Saha’s estimated standard errors in quadrature with mine, which probably slightly overestimates their size.

Fig. 6.— This figure is the same as Fig. 5, except that I have compared the published photometry of Saha et al. to my results according to the January 2005 calibration, after I have largely removed the color-dependent calibration error in my magnitude scales.

Fig. 7.— This figure shows a comparison between the average photometric results for primary and secondary standard stars contained in 616 datasets that do *not* contain any observations of the cluster NGC 2419, and the average results from the 33 datasets that *do* include data for NGC 2419. This comparison does not include the secondary standard sequence in NGC 2419 itself, since by design the first of these two subsamples contains no data for the cluster. The individual stars have been binned into 1.0-mag intervals of V magnitude; the filled circles mark the median magnitude difference in each bin, and the error bars represent a robust

estimate of the $\pm 1\sigma$ dispersion among the differences in each bin.

Fig. 8.— As in Fig. 7, except that here I have compared the average results for primary and secondary standard stars from *only* the 13 WIYN datasets that include NGC 2419 data to the average results from my 616 datasets with no NGC 2419 observations. As before, the filled circles represent the median magnitude differences within 1.0-mag bins, and the error bars show a robust estimate of the $\pm 1\sigma$ dispersions of the differences within the bins.

Fig. 9.— As in Figs. 7 and 8, except that here I have compared the average results for primary and secondary standard stars from *only* the 20 non-WIYN datasets that include NGC 2419 data to the average results from my 616 datasets with no NGC 2419 observations. As before, the filled circles represent the median magnitude differences within 1.0-mag bins, and the error bars show a robust estimate of the $\pm 1\sigma$ dispersions of the differences within the bins.

Fig. 10.— This figure shows the same data as Fig. 7, except that in this case the data are binned in 0.5-mag bins of $V-I$ color, rather than in bins of V magnitude. Over the color range well sampled by Landolt’s primary standard stars, $V-I < 3.5$, there is little evidence for a systematic difference in the quality of the color transformations from those 33 datasets that include NGC 2419 data as compared to the 616 other datasets employed in my analysis.

Fig. 11.— Magnitude residuals δv (left panels) and δi (right panels), in the sense observed instrumental magnitude *minus* the value predicted from the known standard magnitudes and the transformation and extinction coefficients, plotted against the standard V and I magnitudes, respectively, for MiniMos chip 1 (top) and 2 (bottom). Each plotted symbol represents the residual obtained from a single observation of a single primary or secondary standard star on the night that I have named “wiyn3”. The reductions have assumed that the integration times listed in the FITS headers of the individual CCD images, which are

always integer numbers of seconds, are correct. The distribution of fitting residuals breaks up into two clumps. In each of the clumps, the error distribution flares out toward fainter magnitudes, but in the case of each chip/filter combination, the clump consisting of the apparently brighter stars is systematically displaced toward negative values relative to the fainter clump. This indicates that the measured instrumental magnitudes of the brighter standards have systematically been measured too small (too bright) compared to the fainter standards.

Fig. 12.— Magnitude residuals δv (left panels) and δi (right panels), in the sense observed instrumental magnitude *minus* the value predicted from the known standard magnitudes and the transformation and extinction coefficients, plotted against the standard V and I magnitudes, respectively, for MiniMos chip 1 (top) and 2 (bottom). As in Fig. 11, each plotted symbol represents the residual obtained from a single observation of a single primary or secondary standard star except that these are now for the night that I have named “wiyn4.” In this case, the brighter standards have not been shifted toward negative fitting residuals compared to the fainter ones. In fact, a quantitative statistical analysis indicates that in this case the apparently brighter standards have been systematically shifted toward positive residuals: they have been measured too faint compared to the fainter standards. A hint of this effect is visible in the bottom right panel.

Fig. 13.— Magnitude residuals δv (top panel) and δi (bottom panel), in the sense observed instrumental magnitude *minus* the value predicted from the known standard magnitudes and the transformation and extinction coefficients, plotted against the standard V and I magnitudes, respectively, for data obtained with the CCD “s2kb” on the three-night observing run that I have named “abi36.” As in Figs. 11 and 12, each plotted symbol represents the residual obtained from a single observation of a single primary or secondary standard star. Here, the data from all three nights have been included in the same plot. There is no

obvious evidence for a systematic bright-versus-faint split in the fitting residuals.

Fig. 14.— The same photometric fitting residuals as are illustrated in Fig. 11 are plotted here against integration time shown on a logarithmic scale. As in Fig. 11, data from the night “wiyn3” are shown with the *V*-band data on the left, the *I*-band data on the right, the chip 1 data on the top, and the chip 2 data on the bottom. Here the fitting residual of a single observation of a single primary or secondary standard star is shown as a short, thin horizontal line. A long, thick horizontal line marks the position of the median residual at each quantized integration time.

Fig. 15.— The same photometric fitting residuals as are illustrated in Fig. 12 are plotted here against integration time shown on a logarithmic scale. As in Fig. 12, data from the night “wiyn4” are shown with the *V*-band data on the left, the *I*-band data on the right, the chip 1 data on the top, and the chip 2 data on the bottom. Here the fitting residual of a single observation of a single primary or secondary standard star is shown as a short, thin horizontal line. A long, thick horizontal line marks the position of the median residual at each quantized integration time.

Fig. 16.— These panels show the differences in *I*-band magnitude between the weighted average calibrated photometry from all the WIYN 3.5m observing runs taken together on the one hand, and my adopted standard-system values (as of January 2005) on the other, plotted against *V*–*I* color. Each errorbar represents the $\pm 1\sigma$ standard error of the mean difference based on all the WIYN 3.5m data. The upper panel represents the differences when the best-fitting linear color transformation against *V*–*I* color is employed; the bottom panel is for the best-fitting transformation employing a quadratic polynomial in *V*–*I*.

Fig. 17.— This plot is based upon precisely the same data and the same reductions as Fig. 16, except that here I have picked out the *I*-band magnitude differences between the

average WIYN 3.5m results and Landolt’s (1992) published magnitudes for the Landolt stars that were observed during the course of the various WIYN 3.5m observing runs. This plot also includes a few Landolt (1992) standards with published magnitudes based upon fewer than five observations, which were omitted from Fig. 16 because I impose a minimum of five observations on stars which I accept as photometric standards. Landolt star 98 L5 has been omitted from this plot even though it was included among the WIYN observations because its standard indices are extremely uncertain.

Fig. 18.— In this figure, the weighted mean V -band fitting residual of all the primary and secondary standard stars observed within an individual CCD image has been plotted against the airmass at which the observation was obtained, for those nights of WIYN 3.5m observations that are considered photometric. Small filled circles represent results for chip 1 of MiniMos, and large empty circles are for chip 2. Error bars ($\pm 1\sigma$) are also plotted at the position of each point, but in nearly all cases they are smaller than the point itself. For WIYN 3.5m nights “wryn3,” “wryn4,” “wrynb,” and “wrync” (bottom four panels) I used my adopted mean extinction coefficients for the Kitt Peak site; on night “wryn2” I estimated that the extinction was roughly 20% smaller than the site mean values. The total number of distinct observations of primary and secondary standards made in the V filter on each night (in chips 1 and 2 combined) is indicated in the bottom right corner of each panel.

Fig. 19.— The weighted mean I -band fitting residual of all the primary and secondary standard stars observed within an individual CCD image has been plotted against the airmass at which the observation was obtained. As in Fig. 18, data are plotted for the photometric WIYN 3.5m nights, where small filled circles represent results for chip 1 of MiniMos, and large empty circles are for chip 2. Error bars ($\pm 1\sigma$) are also plotted at the position of each point, but in nearly all cases they are smaller than the point itself. The total number of distinct observations of primary and secondary standards made in the I filter on each night

(in chips 1 and 2 combined) is indicated in the bottom right corner of each panel.

Fig. 20.— The weighted mean fitting residuals of all the primary and secondary standard stars contained within an individual CCD image from the night “wync” are plotted as a function of the Universal Time of the observation, for the B , V , R , and I bandpasses (top to bottom). The number in the bottom right corner of each panel indicates the total number of stellar observations (in chips 1 and 2 combined) that went into these averages.

Fig. 21.— The weighted mean V -band fitting residuals of all the Landolt (1992) photometric standard stars observed within an individual CCD image has been plotted against the airmass at which the observation was obtained, for those nights of WIYN 3.5m observations that are considered photometric. As in Figs. 18 and 19, small filled circles represent results for chip 1 of MiniMos, and large empty circles are for chip 2. Error bars ($\pm 1\sigma$) are also plotted at the position of each point. The number in the lower right corner of each panel indicates the total number of standard-star observations represented. These are the data that were employed by Saha et al. to estimate their extinction coefficients. It is evident that if only these stars are used, in some cases it is possible to infer an extinction coefficient that is appreciably different from the one I adopted.

Fig. 22.— The same as Fig. 21, except for the I photometric bandpass.

Fig. 23.— The differences in the calibrated V -band magnitudes obtained on the five photometric WIYN 3.5m nights relative to my adopted standard values for primary and secondary standard stars observed with MiniMos chip 1 have been binned in 0.5-mag intervals of $V-I$ color. The median residual within each bin has been plotted against the mean $V-I$ color of the stars in the bin (filled circles), and the error bars represent a robust measure of the dispersion among the residuals within that bin. As in Figs. 18 through 22, the data have been divided by night: “wync2” (top), “wync3,” “wync4,” “wyncb,” and “wync” (bottom).

Precisely the same color transformation was employed for all five nights, and also for the nonphotometric night “winya” (not illustrated). The number of different standard stars represented is given in the lower right corner of each panel.

Fig. 24.— The same as Fig. 23, except for the V filter and chip 2.

Fig. 25.— The same as Figs. 23 and 24, except for the I filter and chip 1.

Fig. 26.— The same as Figs. 23 through 25, except for the I filter and chip 2.

Fig. 27.— The V -band magnitude differences between my calibrated magnitudes and Landolt’s (1992) published values for stars measured with MiniMos chip 1 on the five photometric nights of observations with the WIYN 3.5m telescope. Where a given Landolt standard has been observed more than once with chip 1 on a given night, I have used the best weighted average of my calibrated magnitudes. These are the data that were employed by Saha et al. to derive their color transformations. It is clear that in a few cases, if these were the only data used, it would be possible to estimate zero-points and color transformations perceptibly different from the ones I adopted. The number of different Landolt standards represented is given in the lower right corner of each panel.

Fig. 28.— The same as Fig. 27, except for the V filter and chip 2.

Fig. 29.— The same as Figs. 27 and 28, except for the I filter and chip 1.

Fig. 30.— The same as Figs. 27 through 29, except for the I filter and chip 2.

Table 1. Photometric datasets for NGC 2419

Observing run	Telescope	Detector	Year/Month	Clr	Cld	<i>B</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>I</i>
nbs	CTIO 4m	RCA1	1983 Jan	5	–	14	14	3	2
jvw	INT 2.5m	RCA	1986 Mar/Apr	–	1	2	2	2	2
cmr	INT 2.5m	GEC	1986 Oct	–	1	5	5	4	6
igs	INT 2.5m	GEC4	1989 Mar/Apr	–	1	1	1	2	1
psb	INT 2.5m	EEV5	1992 Mar	3	1	4	3	6	1
rjt	INT 2.5m	EEV5	1992 Apr/May	–	1	6	6	6	3
brewer	CFHT 3.6m	lick2	1991 Sep	–	1	–	4	–	2
bond	KPNO 4m	t2kb	1994 Apr	1	–	4	4	–	4
bolte	KPNO 2.1m	t1ka	1994 Apr	1	1	–	20	–	22
aaj	INT 2.5m	EEV5	1994 Nov	1	–	–	6	–	8
mxt	INT 2.5m	TEK3	1995 Apr	2	–	2	2	2	1
wiyna	WIYN 3.5m	MiniMos	2000 Sep	–	2	–	6	–	6
wiync	WIYN 3.5m	MiniMos	2001 Feb	2	–	5	6	5	6
wiynb	WIYN 3.5m	MiniMos	2001 Apr	2	–	–	–	–	–
wiyn4	WIYN 3.5m	MiniMos	2001 Sep	2	–	–	4	–	4
wiyn3	WIYN 3.5m	MiniMos	2001 Dec	2	–	–	3	–	5
abi36	WIYN 0.9m	s2kb	2002 Nov	3	–	3	3	3	3
wiyn2	WIYN 3.5m	MiniMos	2003 Feb	2	–	4	2	2	2

This figure "fg1.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg2.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg3.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg4.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg5.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg6.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg7.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg8.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg9.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg10.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg11.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg12.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg13.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg14.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg15.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg16.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg17.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg18.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg19.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg20.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg21.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg22.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg23.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg24.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg25.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg26.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg27.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg28.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg29.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>

This figure "fg30.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0503393v1>